UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,936	11/05/2001	Robert F. Kaiko	200.1102CP2	9880
23280 7590 05/26/2009 Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC 485 7th Avenue 14th Floor			EXAMINER	
			FAY, ZOHREH A	
New York, NY 10018			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1612	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/26/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/992,936	KAIKO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	ZOHREH A. FAY	1612				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 No</u>	ovember 2007					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	·					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3,8-10,12-27,29-32 and 35-45</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3,8-10,12-27,29-32 and 35-45</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/102007</u> . 6) Other:						

Art Unit: 1612

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 5, 2007 has been entered.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3, 8-10, 12-27, 29-32, 35-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nutt et ., (Clinical Pharmacology and therapeutics, Vol. 15, Number 2, PP. 156-166) in view of Mayer et al. (US 5,556,838), Ockert (US 5,376,662) and European Patent Application 0 193 355.

Nut et al. teach the use of an opioid agonist, methadone and an opioid antagonist naloxone in combination. The above reference also teaches that the mixture has significantly less miotic, behavioral and subjective effect than methadone alone. See the abstract. The primary reference differs from the claimed invention in specific opioid agonist of certain dependent claims, the opioid antagonist of the dependent claims and a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory compound, such as acetaminophen. Mayer et al. teach the use of the claimed opioid agonists as narcotic/ analgesics. See column 2, lines 52-68 and column 3, lines 5-25. Ockert teaches the use of the opioid antagonists for the treatment of pain. See the abstract. Ockert also teaches that opioid antagonists antagonize the exogenous opiates. See column 4, lines 8-11. The European Patent application teaches the use of opioid agonist, codeine in combination with acetaminophen for the treatment of pain. See the abstract. The concentration of codeine is taught on page 10, lines 8 and 9. The concentration of acetaminophen is taught on page 10, lines 10-12. It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art

to combine an opioid agonist, an opioid antagonist and acetaminophen in combination, considering that the prior art teaches that each of the components have been used for the treatment of pain. The prior art also teaches that opiate antagonists reduce the side effects generated by opioid agonists.

One skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of the above reference, since they in combination relates to the use of the claimed components individually for the treatment of pain. The relied upon references also teach the addition of opioid antagonists to opioids decreases the side effects associated with the use of opioids. Applicant has presented no evidence to establish the unexpected or unobvious nature of the claimed invention, and as such claims 1, 3, 8-10, 12-27, 29-32 and 35-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ZOHREH A. FAY whose telephone number is (571)272-0573. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fredrick Krass can be reached on (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/992,936 Page 5

Art Unit: 1612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Z.F /Zohreh A Fay/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612